MATHEMATICS OF COMPUTATION
Volume 00, Number 0, Pages 000–000
S 0025-5718(XX)0000-0

EFFICIENT REALIZATION OF THE MIXED FINITE ELEMENT DISCRETIZATION FOR NONLINEAR PROBLEMS

PETER KNABNER AND GERHARD SUMM

ABSTRACT. We consider implementational aspects of the mixed finite element method for a special class of nonlinear problems. We establish the equivalence of the hybridized formulation of the mixed finite element method to a nonconforming finite element method with augmented Crouzeix-Raviart ansatz space. We discuss the reduction of unknowns by static condensation and propose Newton's method for the solution of local and global systems. Finally, we show, how such a nonlinear problem arises from the mixed formulation of Darcy–Forchheimer flow in porous media.

1. INTRODUCTION

The mixed finite element method is widely used for the discretization of flow problems, since it provides a direct and accurate approximation of the flux. However, the mixed finite element discretization gives rise to large systems of algebraic equations, which are difficult to solve, because they are of saddle point type. For linear problems the introduction of inter-element multipliers, commonly called hybridization, is frequently used to transform this saddle point problem into a problem, whose matrix is symmetric and positive definite (cf. [4, § V.1]). Furthermore static condensation can be used to reduce the size of the system, which finally has to be solved. Exploiting the equivalence of the hybridized mixed finite element method to certain nonconforming finite element methods, several authors develop multigrid methods to solve the resulting system of linear equations (see e.g. [1], [3], [5]). As far as we know, for nonlinear problems results of this kind are still missing. In this article, we describe, how the above mentioned techniques can be generalized to a certain class of doubly nonlinear equations of monotone type. We consider a bounded domain Ω with polygonal boundary $\partial\Omega$. As usual, the Lebesgue spaces are denoted by $L^r(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ and equpped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{0,r,\Omega}$. $(L^s(\Omega))^2$ is the space of vector functions $\mathbf{v}$, whose components belong to $L^s(\Omega)$.

We consider the variational problem:
Find $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in V \times Q$ such that

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - b(\mathbf{v}, p) = g(\mathbf{v}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in V\,, \tag{1.1a}$$

$$c(p, q) + b(\mathbf{u}, q) = f(q) \quad \text{for all } q \in Q\,. \tag{1.1b}$$

Received by the editor May 29, 2001.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 65N30, 65N22; Secondary 35K60, 47J30.
Key words and phrases. mixed finite elements, nonlinear elliptic problems, implementation, equivalence, nonconforming method, static condensation.

©1997 American Mathematical Society

Here $Q := L^r(\Omega)$ and V is defined by

$$V := \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in (L^s(\Omega))^n \;\middle|\; \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} \in L^{r'}(\Omega) \right\} , \tag{1.2}$$

where $r, s \in (1, \infty)$ and $1/r + 1/r' = 1$. The bilinear form b on $V \times Q$ is defined by $b(\mathbf{v}, q) := \int_\Omega \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} q \, d\mathbf{x}$, g and f are linear forms on V and Q, resp., and a and c are continuous (nonlinear) forms on $V \times V$ and $Q \times Q$, resp., defined by

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \int_\Omega G(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} \quad \text{and} \quad c(p, q) := \int_\Omega R(p) \, q \, d\mathbf{x} ,$$

where $R : L^r(\Omega) \to L^{r'}(\Omega)$ is a continuous mapping and $G : (L^s(\Omega))^n \to \left(L^{s'}(\Omega)\right)^n$ is a strictly monotone, coercive and continuous mapping. A variational problem like (1.1) occurs as mixed formulation

$$\left.\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{u}) + \nabla p &= 0 \\ R(p) + \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= f \end{aligned}\right\} \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{1.3}$$

of the doubly nonlinear elliptic equation

$$R(p) - \operatorname{div} G^{-1}(\nabla p) = f \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{1.4}$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions $p = g$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then the linear forms g and f are defined by

$$g(\mathbf{v}) := \int_{\partial\Omega} g \, (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \, d\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad f(q) := \int_\Omega f q \, d\mathbf{x} .$$

2. Discretization with the mixed finite element method

Replacing the infinite-dimensional spaces V and Q in (1.1) by finite-dimensional subspaces $V_h \subset V$ and $Q_h \subset Q$ we arrive at the mixed finite element method.

2.1. The finite-dimensional spaces V_h and Q_h.

The solution of nonlinear problems like (1.4) is, in general, not very regular. In addition, we have to deal with nonsmooth parameter functions in our applications. Thus an approximation by higher-order finite elements makes no sense. Therefore we choose the Raviart–Thomas space of lowest order, i.e.

$$V_h := RT_0(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) = \left\{ \mathbf{v}_h \in V \;\middle|\; \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in RT_0(K) \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} , \tag{2.1a}$$

$$Q_h := \left\{ q_h \in Q \;\middle|\; q_h|_K \in P_0(K) \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} , \tag{2.1b}$$

where $RT_0(K)$ is defined by

$$RT_0(K) := \left(P_0(K)\right)^2 + \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} P_0(K) .$$

Here $P_k(K)$ denotes the space of polynomials of degree $\le k$ on K; hence $P_0(K)$ is the space of constants on K. The definition of V_h and Q_h is based on a triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$ of Ω into triangular elements K. We denote by $\mathcal{E}_h$ the set of edges of $\mathcal{T}_h$, which can be subdivided into the set of interior edges $\mathcal{E}_h^i := \{e \in \mathcal{E}_h \mid e \not\subset \partial\Omega\}$ and the set of boundary edges $\mathcal{E}_h^b := \{e \in \mathcal{E}_h \mid e \subset \partial\Omega\}$. In addition, we define a unit normal vector $\mathbf{n}_e$ for every $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$. The orientation of $\mathbf{n}_e$ is arbitrary.

The requirement $\mathbf{v}_h \in V$ implies that the normal components of the fluxes across interior edges are continuous:

Lemma 2.1. *The following definition for V is equivalent to* (1.2)*:*

$$V = \Big\{ \mathbf{v} \in (L^s(\Omega))^n \,\Big|\, (\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v})|_K \in L^{r'}(K) \quad \forall\ K \in \mathcal{T}_h\,, \\ \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} (\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n}_K)\,\varphi\,d\sigma = 0 \quad \forall\ \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \Big\}\,.$$

Here $\mathbf{n}_K$ denotes the exterior unit normal of K and $\mathcal{D}(\Omega) = C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ is the space of test functions.

Proof. Evidently, "$\subseteq$" holds, since $V \subset (L^s(\Omega))^n$ and $(\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v})|_K \in L^{r'}(K)$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Furthermore, for all $\mathbf{v} \in V$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ Green's formula implies

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} (\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n}_K)\,\varphi\,d\sigma = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\int_K \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} + \int_K \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}\,\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} \right) \\ = \int_\Omega \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} + \int_\Omega \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}\,\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial\Omega} (\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,\varphi\,d\sigma = 0\,.$$

To prove that "$\supseteq$" holds, too, we must show that each $\mathbf{v} \in (L^s(\Omega))^n$, which fulfills the above requirements, has a generalized divergence in $L^{r'}(\Omega)$. To this end, we define $w \in L^{r'}(\Omega)$ by $w|_K = \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Then for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ it holds

$$\int_\Omega w\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}\,\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\int_{\partial K} (\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n}_K)\,\varphi\,d\sigma - \int_K \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} \right) \\ = -\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\varphi\,d\mathbf{x} = -\int_\Omega \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\varphi\,d\mathbf{x}\,.$$

Hence, w is the (generalized) divergence of $\mathbf{v}$, as desired. □

Since every $\mathbf{v}_h|_K \in RT_0(K)$ is uniquely determined by the values for the fluxes $v_e := \int_e \mathbf{v}_h|_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_e\,d\sigma$ across the edges $e \subset \partial K$ (cf. [4, Prop. III.3.3]), the fluxes v_e, $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$, can be used as degrees of freedom in $V_h = RT_0(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)$. The corresponding basis functions $\{\mathbf{w}_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h}$ are defined by the requirements

$$\int_f \mathbf{w}_e \cdot \mathbf{n}_f\,d\sigma = \delta_{e,f} = \begin{cases} 1\,, & \text{if} \quad e = f \\ 0\,, & \text{if} \quad e \neq f \end{cases}\,.$$

2.2. **Hybridization.** The discrete mixed formulation reads:
Find $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in V_h \times Q_h$, such that

$$a(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) - b(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h) = g(\mathbf{v}_h) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h\,, \tag{2.2a}$$

$$c(p_h, q_h) + b(\mathbf{u}_h, q_h) = f(q_h) \quad \text{for all } q_h \in Q_h\,. \tag{2.2b}$$

For linear problems, the system of linear equations resulting from (2.2) is difficult to solve. Therefore this system is transformed by means of hybridization. To this end, the finite-dimensional space V_h is enlarged to the space W_h, which is defined as follows:

$$W_h := RT_{-1}(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) = \left\{ \mathbf{v}_h \in (L^s(\Omega))^n \;\middle|\; \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in RT_0(K) \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\}.$$

Weakening the requirement $\mathbf{v}_h \in V$ to $\mathbf{v}_h \in (L^s(\Omega))^n$ means that the normal components of the fluxes across interior edges must not be continuous anymore. Therefore $\mathbf{v}_h \in W_h$ is uniquely defined by the degrees of freedom $v_{K,e} := \int_e \mathbf{v}_h|_K \cdot$

$\mathbf{n}_K\, d\sigma$ for $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $e \subset \partial K$. Here $\mathbf{n}_K$ is the exterior unit normal with respect to K. We denote the corresponding basis functions by $\mathbf{w}_{K,e}$.

To assure continuity of the fluxes, an additional equation is introduced, where Lagrange-multipliers $\lambda_h \in \Lambda_h$ are employed. Here Λ_h is defined by

$$\Lambda_h := \left\{ \lambda_h \in L^2(E_h) \;\middle|\; \lambda_h|_e \in P_0(e) \quad \text{for all } e \in \mathcal{E}_h \right\},$$

where $E_h := \bigcup \{ e \,|\, e \in \mathcal{E}_h \}$. In particular, we consider subspaces Λ_h^g of Λ_h, where for arbitrary $g \in L^1(\partial\Omega)$

$$\Lambda_h^g := \left\{ \lambda_h \in \Lambda_h \;\middle|\; \int_e (\lambda_h - g)\, d\sigma = 0 \quad \text{for all } e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b \right\}.$$

Then the hybridized mixed formulation reads:
Find $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \mu_h) \in W_h \times Q_h \times \Lambda_h^g$, such that

$$a(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} b_K(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} d_K(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_h \in W_h\,, \tag{2.3a}$$

$$c(p_h, q_h) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} b_K(\mathbf{u}_h, q_h) = f(q_h) \quad \text{for all } q_h \in Q_h\,, \tag{2.3b}$$

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} d_K(\lambda_h, \mathbf{u}_h) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \lambda_h \in \Lambda_h^0\,, \tag{2.3c}$$

where $b_K(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) := \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h q_h \, d\mathbf{x}$ and $d_K(\lambda_h, \mathbf{v}_h) := \int_{\partial K} \lambda_h (\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K)\, d\sigma$ for $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Note that we are allowed to identify the solutions $\mathbf{u}_h \in W_h$ and $p_h \in Q_h$ of (2.3) with the solutions of (2.2).

Theorem 2.2. a) *Let $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in V_h \times Q_h$ be a solution of (2.2). Then there exists a unique $\mu_h \in \Lambda_h^g$ such that $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \mu_h)$ is a solution of (2.3).*

b) *Let $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \mu_h) \in W_h \times Q_h \times \Lambda_h^g$ be a solution of (2.3). Then $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h)$ is a solution of (2.2).*

Note that the nonlinear forms a and c remain unchanged in both formulations (2.2) and (2.3). Thus the proof of Theorem 2.2 does not differ from the linear case (cf. the derivation of Thm. V.1.1 in [4]).

3. Equivalence to a nonconforming finite element method

Like in [1], we can develop a nonconforming finite element method for the numerical solution of equation (1.4), which yields the same solutions as (2.3). We consider the nonconforming ansatz space $\mathcal{N}_h := CR_1^0(\mathcal{T}_h) \oplus \mathcal{B}^3(\mathcal{T}_h)$, where

$$CR_1^0(\mathcal{T}_h) := \left\{ \xi_h \in L^2(\Omega) \;\middle|\; \xi_h|_K \in P_1(K)\ \forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h\,, \right.$$
$$\left. \xi_h \text{ is continuous in } M_e\ \forall\, e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i\,,\ \int_e \xi_h \, d\sigma = 0\ \forall\, e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b \right\}$$

is the nonconforming Crouzeix–Raviart ansatz space of piecewise linear functions, which are continuous only at the midpoints M_e of interior edges. It is well known that $CR_1^0(\mathcal{T}_h) \not\subset W^{1,1}(\Omega)$. Since the midpoint rule is exact for affine-linear functions, i.e. $\int_e \xi_h \, d\sigma = |e|\, \xi_h(M_e)$, the value of the integral $\int_e \xi_h \, d\sigma$ is uniquely defined for every interior edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$. Moreover, we define the space of bubble functions

$$\mathcal{B}^3(\mathcal{T}_h) := \left\{ \xi_h \in L^2(\Omega) \;\middle|\; \xi_h|_K \in P_3(K)\ \forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h\,,\ \xi_h|_{\partial K} = 0\ \forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\}.$$

A basis for $\mathcal{B}^3(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is provided by $\big\{ \prod_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i^K \;\big|\; K \in \mathcal{T}_h \big\}$, where λ_i^K are the barycentric coordinates of the triangle K, which are extended by zero outside of K.

To describe the nonconforming finite element method, we need some projection operators. At first we introduce the well-known L^2-projection operators P_{Q_h}, P_{Λ_h} and $P_{\Lambda_h^0}$, which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{Q_h} : L^2(\Omega) \to Q_h \;\; &: \quad \int_\Omega (\varphi - P_{Q_h}\varphi)\, q_h \, d\mathbf{x} = 0 \qquad \text{for all } q_h \in Q_h \,, \\
P_{\Lambda_h} : L^2(E_h) \to \Lambda_h \;\; &: \quad \int_{E_h} (\varphi - P_{\Lambda_h}\varphi)\, \lambda_h \, d\sigma = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \lambda_h \in \Lambda_h \,, \\
P_{\Lambda_h^0} : L^2(E_h^i) \to \Lambda_h^0 \;\; &: \quad \int_{E_h^i} \Big(\varphi - P_{\Lambda_h^0}\varphi\Big)\, \lambda_h \, d\sigma = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \lambda_h \in \Lambda_h^0 \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $E_h^i := \bigcup\{ e \,|\, e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i \}$. Remember that the definitions of the spaces Q_h, Λ_h and Λ_h^0 contain no continuity requirements. Thus P_{Q_h} is defined element by element, P_{Λ_h} and $P_{\Lambda_h^0}$ are defined edge by edge.

Using these projection operators, we can define a mapping $\mathcal{S}_h : \mathcal{N}_h \to Q_h \times \Lambda_h^0$ by means of

$$\mathcal{S}_h(\xi_h) = \Big(P_{Q_h}\xi_h, P_{\Lambda_h^0}\xi_h \Big) \quad \text{for } \xi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h \,.$$

Since $\ker \mathcal{S}_h = 0$, $\mathcal{S}_h$ is an isomorphism (cf. [3, (1.15)]). In the following, let $\tilde{g}$ be a sufficiently smooth function on Ω, which satisfies $\int_e \tilde{g}\, d\sigma = \int_e g\, d\sigma$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b$. Then we can define a bijective mapping

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_h^{\tilde{g}} : \mathcal{N}_h + \tilde{g} \to Q_h \times \Lambda_h^g \quad , \quad \psi_h \mapsto (P_{Q_h}\psi_h, P_{\Lambda_h}\psi_h) \,.$$

Here, sufficiently smooth means that $P_{\Lambda_h}\psi_h$ has to be well defined for $\psi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h + \tilde{g}$.

Finally, we need a nonlinear projector $\widetilde{P}_{W_h} : (L^s(\Omega))^2 \to W_h$. Generalizing the linear case considered in [1], we define $\widetilde{P}_{W_h}\mathbf{u}$ for $\mathbf{u} \in (L^s(\Omega))^2$ by the requirement

$$a\big(\widetilde{P}_{W_h}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_h\big) = \int_\Omega G\big(\widetilde{P}_{W_h}\mathbf{u}\big) \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} = a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_h \in W_h \,.$$

Since G is continuous, coercive and strictly monotone, the Theorem of Browder and Minty [8, Thm. 26.A] implies that $\widetilde{P}_{W_h}\mathbf{u} \in W_h$ is uniquely defined. Like P_{Q_h} also $\widetilde{P}_{W_h}$ is defined element by element, since the definition of W_h contains no continuity requirements.

Now, we can formulate the nonconforming finite element method:
Find $\psi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h + \tilde{g}$, such that for all $\xi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h$

$$c(P_{Q_h}\psi_h, P_{Q_h}\xi_h) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \widetilde{P}_{W_h} G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h) \cdot \nabla\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} = f(P_{Q_h}\xi_h) \,. \tag{3.1}$$

The following two lemmas, which establish the equivalence between (2.3) and (3.1), generalize Thm. 1 in [1] to the nonlinear case.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $G(-\mathbf{v}) = -G(\mathbf{v})$. Let $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \mu_h) \in W_h \times Q_h \times \Lambda_h^g$ be a solution of (2.3) and define $\psi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h + \tilde{g}$ by $\psi_h := \big(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_h^{\tilde{g}}\big)^{-1}\big((p_h, \mu_h)\big)$. Then ψ_h is a solution of (3.1) and*

$$\mathbf{u}_h = -\widetilde{P}_{W_h} G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h) \,. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. We begin with the proof of (3.2). Let $\mathbf{v}_h \in W_h$ be given. Since $(\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h)|_K \in P_0(K)$ and $(\mathbf{v}_h|_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_K)|_e \in P_0(e)$ for every $e \subset \partial K$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
a\big(\widetilde{P}_{W_h} G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h), \mathbf{v}_h\big) &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K G\big(G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h)\big)\cdot \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \nabla\psi_h \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\int_{\partial K} \psi_h \, (\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma - \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h \, \psi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \right) \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\int_{\partial K} P_{\Lambda_h^0} \psi_h \, (\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma - \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h \, P_{Q_h} \psi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \right) \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\int_{\partial K} \mu_h \, (\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma - \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h \, p_h \psi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \right) \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} d_K(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}_h) - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} b_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h) = -a(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \\
&= -\int_\Omega G(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_\Omega G(-\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} = a(-\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \, .
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\widetilde{P}_{W_h} G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h) \in W_h$ is uniquely defined, (3.2) follows.

To show that ψ_h is a solution of (3.1), we subtract (2.3c) from (2.3b). Owing to the definitions of b_K and d_K, this yields:

$$c(p_h, q_h) + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \, q_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} \lambda_h \, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma = f(q_h)$$

for all $(q_h, \lambda_h) \in Q_h \times \Lambda_h^0$. Next we define $\xi_h := \mathcal{S}_h^{-1}\left((q_h, \lambda_h)\right)$ such that $q_h = P_{Q_h}\xi_h$ and $\lambda_h = P_{\Lambda_h^0}\xi_h$. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
c(P_{Q_h}\psi_h, P_{Q_h}\xi_h) &+ \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \, P_{Q_h}\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&- \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} P_{\Lambda_h^0}\xi_h \, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma = f(P_{Q_h}\xi_h)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for all $\xi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h$. Employing (3.2) and the definitions of P_{Q_h} and $P_{\Lambda_h^0}$, the second and third term on the left hand side of (3.3), can be transformed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \, P_{Q_h}\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} &- \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} P_{\Lambda_h^0}\xi_h (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \, \xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} \xi_h \, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K -\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \nabla\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \widetilde{P}_{W_h} G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h) \cdot \nabla\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \, .
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting this identity into (3.3) finally yields (3.1). □

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $G(-\mathbf{v}) = -G(\mathbf{v})$. Let $\psi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h + \tilde{g}$ be a solution of (3.1). Let $\mathbf{u}_h \in W_h$ be defined by (3.2) and $(p_h, \mu_h) \in Q_h \times \Lambda_h^g$ by $(p_h, \mu_h) = \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_h^{\tilde{g}}(\psi_h)$. Then $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \mu_h)$ is a solution of (2.3).*

Proof. Employing the definitions of $\mathbf{u}_h$, p_h and μ_h, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) &= -a\big(\widetilde{P}_{W_h} G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h), \mathbf{v}_h\big) = -\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \nabla\psi_h \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h \, \psi_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial K} \psi_h (\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma \right) \\ &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h \, P_{Q_h}\psi_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} P_{\Lambda_h}\psi_h (\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma \\ &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_h \, p_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} \tilde{\mu}_h (\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, d\sigma \\ &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} b_K(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h) - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} d_K(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in W_h$. Hence (2.3a) is fulfilled.

Next we show that (2.3b) and (2.3c) are fulfilled, too. Using (3.2) and partial integration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \widetilde{P}_{W_h} G^{-1}(\nabla\psi_h) \cdot \nabla\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K -\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \nabla\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \, \xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \xi_h \, d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

for all $\xi_h \in \mathcal{N}_h$. Inserting this identity into (3.1) and using $p_h = P_{Q_h}\psi_h$ yields

$$c(p_h, P_{Q_h}\xi_h) + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \, P_{Q_h}\xi_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_K) \, P_{\Lambda_h^0}\xi_h \, d\sigma = f(P_{Q_h}\xi_h).$$

Choosing ξ_h, such that $P_{Q_h}\xi_h = q_h \in Q_h$ and $P_{\Lambda_h^0}\xi_h = 0$, we obtain (2.3b). In a similar manner, we obtain (2.3c), if we choose ξ_h with $P_{Q_h}\xi_h = 0$ and $P_{\Lambda_h^0}\xi_h = \lambda_h \in \Lambda_h^0$. □

4. Static Condensation

Hybridization introduces many additional degrees of freedom into the problem. Since most degrees of freedom can be eliminated locally, this drawback can be avoided using static condensation.

The unknown functions $\mathbf{u}_h \in W_h$, $p_h \in Q_h$ and $\mu_h \in \Lambda_h^g$ can be represented by

$$\mathbf{u}_h = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{e\in\partial K} u_{K,e}\mathbf{w}_{K,e} \,, \quad p_h = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} p_K \chi_K \,, \quad \mu_h = \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h} \mu_e \chi_e \,.$$

Here $\mathbf{w}_{K,e}$ denote the basis functions of W_h (cf. Subsection 2.2), and χ_K and χ_e denote the characteristic functions of K and e, resp.

Employing these basis functions in (2.3) as test functions, i.e., $\mathbf{v}_h = \mathbf{w}_{K,\bar{e}}$ for $(K,\bar{e}) \in \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathcal{E}_h$ with $\bar{e} \subset \partial K$, $q_h = \chi_K$ for $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $\lambda_h = \chi_{\bar{e}}$ for $\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$, we

obtain the following system of algebraic equations:

$$F_{K,\bar e} := a(\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{w}_{K,\bar e}) - p_K + \mu_{\bar e} = 0\,, \qquad K \in \mathcal{T}_h,\ \bar e \subset \partial K\,, \tag{4.1a}$$

$$F_K := c(p_K, \chi_K) + \sum_{e\subset\partial K} u_{K,e} - \int_K f\,d\mathbf{x} = 0\,, \qquad K \in \mathcal{T}_h\,, \tag{4.1b}$$

$$F_{\bar e} := u_{K,\bar e} + u_{K',\bar e} = 0\,, \qquad \bar e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i,\ \bar e = \partial K \cap \partial K'\,. \tag{4.1c}$$

Here $\mathbf{u}_K \in RT_0(K)$ is defined by $\mathbf{u}_K := \sum_{e\in\partial K} u_{K,e}\mathbf{w}_{K,e}$. For the derivation of (4.1) we employed the fact that the basis functions $\mathbf{w}_{K,e}$ of W_h satisfy

$$\int_\Omega \operatorname{div}\mathbf{w}_{K,e}\,d\mathbf{x} = \int_K \operatorname{div}\mathbf{w}_{K,e}\,d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{w}_{K,e}\cdot\mathbf{n}_K\,d\sigma = \int_e \mathbf{w}_{K,e}\cdot\mathbf{n}_K\,d\sigma = 1\,.$$

In this section we discuss three approaches to eliminate degrees of freedom locally (i.e., on a single element). This will lead to an enormous reduction of the number of equations that have to be solved globally.

4.1. **Elimination of the flux variables.** Considering (4.1a), we observe that the degrees of freedom $u_{K,e}$ ($e \subset \partial K$) for fixed $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ appear only in equations (4.1a) for $\bar e \subset \partial K$. Hence for each $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ we can eliminate $u_{K,e}$ for $e \subset \partial K$ by solving the system of equations

$$\Big(F_{K,\bar e}\big((u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K}, p_K, (\mu_e)_{e\subset\partial K}\big)\Big)_{\bar e\subset\partial K} = \vec 0\,. \tag{4.2}$$

In Lemma 4.1 we show that this system has a unique solution. For the remainder of this section we denote the triple of flux variables by $\vec u_K := (u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Since $\{\mathbf{w}_{K,e} \mid e \subset \partial K\}$ is a basis of $V_K := RT_0(K)$, every $\vec v_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$ corresponds to a unique $\mathbf{v}_K = \sum_{e\subset\partial K} v_{K,e}\mathbf{w}_{K,e} \in V_K$. Thus we can identify $\vec v_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbf{v}_K \in V_K$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\big(p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\big) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ be given. Then there is a unique $\mathbf{u}_K \in V_K$, that satisfies* (4.2).

Proof. We equip $V_K = RT_0(K)$ with the $(L^s(K))^2$-Norm $\|\cdot\|_{V_K} = \|\cdot\|_{0,s,K}$. System (4.2) is equivalent to the variational problem (cf. (2.3a)):
Find $\mathbf{u}_K \in V_K$, such that

$$a_K(\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K) = \int_K \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}_K\, p_K\,d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{f\subset\partial K}\int_f \mu_f(\mathbf{v}_K\cdot\mathbf{n}_K)\,d\sigma =: \tilde g_K(\mathbf{v}_K)\,, \tag{4.3}$$

where a_K denotes the nonlinear form defined by $a_K(\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K) = \int_K G(\mathbf{u}_K)\cdot\mathbf{v}_K\,d\mathbf{x}$. Since p_K and $(\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}$ are given, $\tilde g_K$ is a continuous linear form on V_K. We define an operator $A_K : V_K \to V_K'$ by means of

$$\langle A_K\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K\rangle_{V_K'\times V_K} := a_K(\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K \in V_K\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Owing to the properties of G, A_K is continuous, coercive and strictly monotone on V_K. Therefore the Theorem of Browder and Minty [8, Thm. 26.A] yields that there exists a unique solution $\mathbf{u}_K \in V_K$ of (4.3). □

In general, the system (4.2) has no closed form solution. Then we can use Newton's method to find an approximative solution. To this end, it is necessary that the Jacobian matrix $(\partial F_{K,\bar e}/\partial u_{K,e})_{\bar e, e\subset\partial K}$ is well-defined and invertible.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $G : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be continuously differentiable. Then for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and any choice of $\left(p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ the mapping*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3 \quad , \quad (u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K} \mapsto \left(F_{K,\bar{e}}\left((u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K}, p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right)\right)_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K}$$

is continuously differentiable in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Proof. We must show the continuity of the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial F_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}_K) = \frac{\partial f_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}_K)\,, \quad \bar{e}, \bar{f} \subset \partial K\,,$$

where $f_{K,\bar{e}} : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{u}_K) := a_K(\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{w}_{K,\bar{e}}) = \int_K G(\mathbf{u}_K)\cdot\mathbf{w}_{K,\bar{e}}\,d\mathbf{x}\,. \tag{4.5}$$

To this end, it suffices to prove that the integrand $G(\mathbf{u}_K)\cdot\mathbf{w}_{K,\bar{e}}$ is continuously differentiable. This integrand is a composition of G with the mappings $\vec{u}_K \mapsto \mathbf{u}_K := \sum_{e\in\partial K} u_{K,e}\mathbf{w}_{K,e}$, $\mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^2$, and $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{w}_{K,\bar{e}}$, $\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$. Obviously, all these mappings are continuously differentiable. Hence $\vec{u}_K \mapsto G(\mathbf{u}_K)\cdot\mathbf{w}_{K,\bar{e}}$, $\mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$, is continuously differentiable, too. □

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that there is a constant $\underline{a} > 0$ and a norm $\|\cdot\|_{V_K}$ on V_K such that the operator $A_K : V_K \to V_K'$ defined in (4.4) fulfills*

$$\|A_K\mathbf{u}_K - A_K\mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K'} \geq \underline{a}\,\|\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K \in V_K\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Then the Jacobian matrix

$$D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K\left((u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K}\right) := \left(\frac{\partial F_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}\left((u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K}, p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right)\right)_{\bar{e},\bar{f}\subset\partial K}$$

is invertible for all $\vec{u} = (u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Proof. Since V_K is finite-dimensional, the euclidean norm $|\vec{v}_K|$ and $\|\mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K}$ are equivalent. In particular, there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that $|\vec{v}_K| \leq C_1\|\mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K}$. As observed in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we have

$$D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u}_K) = \left(\frac{\partial F_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}_K)\right)_{\bar{e},\bar{f}\subset\partial K} = \left(\frac{\partial f_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}_K)\right)_{\bar{e},\bar{f}\subset\partial K}\,,$$

where $f_{K,\bar{e}} : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined in (4.5). For every linear form $\mathbf{v}_K' \in V_K'$ there exists a unique triple $\left(v'_{K,e}\right)_{e\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ by means of evaluation at the test functions:

$$\mathbf{v}_K' \mapsto \left(\langle\mathbf{v}_K', \mathbf{w}_{K,e}\rangle_{V_K'\times V_K}\right)_{e\subset\partial K} =: \left(v'_{K,e}\right)_{e\subset\partial K}$$

Hence $\|\mathbf{v}_K'\|_{V_K'}$ and $\left|\left(v'_{K,e}\right)_{e\subset\partial K}\right|$ are equivalent norms on V_K'. In particular, there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that $\left\|\mathbf{v}_K'\right\|_{V_K'} \leq C_2\left|\left(v'_{K,e}\right)_{e\subset\partial K}\right|$.

Now let the linear form $\mathbf{v}_K'$ be the image $A_K\mathbf{u}_K$ of $\mathbf{u}_K = \sum_{e\subset\partial K} u_{K,e}\mathbf{w}_{K,e} \in V_K$ for an arbitrary $\vec{u}_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Then we have $\langle A_K\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{w}_{K,\bar{e}}\rangle_{V_K'\times V_K} = f_{K,\bar{e}}\left(\vec{u}_K\right)$ for every $\bar{e} \subset \partial K$. Therefore the following inequality holds for all $\vec{v}_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\vec{v}_K - \vec{u}_K| &\leq C_1\,\|\mathbf{v}_K - \mathbf{u}_K\|_{V_K} \leq \frac{C_1}{\underline{a}}\,\|A_K\mathbf{v}_K - A_K\mathbf{u}_K\|_{V_K'} \\ &\leq \frac{C_1C_2}{\underline{a}}\left|\left(f_{K,\bar{e}}\left(\vec{v}_K\right) - f_{K,\bar{e}}\left(\vec{u}_K\right)\right)_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K}\right|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Now it is easy to show that the Jacobian matrix $D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u}_K)$ is invertible. Since $(f_{K,\bar{e}})_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K}$ is differentiable, we have

$$(f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{v}_K) - f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{u}_K))_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K} = D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u}_K)(\vec{v}_K - \vec{u}_K) + o(|\vec{v}_K - \vec{u}_K|)$$

for all $\vec{v}_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$. If $D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u}_K)$ was not invertible, there would exist $\vec{w}_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u}_K)\vec{w}_K = \vec{0}$. But this would imply that $\vec{v}_K = \vec{u}_K + \kappa\vec{w}_K$ for some $\kappa > 0$ would fulfill

$$(f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{v}_K) - f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{u}_K))_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K} = o(|\kappa\vec{w}_K|) = o(|\vec{v}_K - \vec{u}_K|)\ .$$

Consequently, we would obtain in the limit $\kappa \to 0$

$$\lim_{|\vec{v}_K - \vec{u}_K|\to 0} \frac{\left|(f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{v}_K) - f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{u}_K))_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K}\right|}{|\vec{v}_K - \vec{u}_K|} = 0\,,$$

which is a contradiction to (4.7). □

4.2. **Elimination of flux and element variables – 1st possibility.** Assuming additional monotonicity requirements for R, we can eliminate also the element variables p_K by solving equations (4.1b). A closer look onto (4.1b) shows that

$$\int_K f\,d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{e\subset\partial K} u_{K,e} = c(p_K,\chi_K) = \int_\Omega R(p_K)\chi_K\,d\mathbf{x} = \int_K R(p_K)\,d\mathbf{x}\,.$$

To ensure that p_K is uniquely defined by this identity we have to require that the mapping $C_K : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $p_K \mapsto \int_K R(p_K)\,d\mathbf{x}$ is strictly monotone. Then C_K is invertible and we can solve the above equation:

$$p_K = p_K(\vec{u}_K) := C_K^{-1}\left(\int_K f\,d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{e\subset\partial K} u_{K,e}\right)\,.$$

Inserting this relation into (4.1a) yields

$$\bar{F}_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{u}_K) := a(\mathbf{u}_K,\mathbf{w}_{K,e}) - p_K(\vec{u}_K) + \mu_{\bar{e}} = f_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{u}_K) + \mu_{\bar{e}} = 0\,, \tag{4.8}$$

where $f_{K,\bar{e}}$ is still defined as in (4.5). Now we can solve the systems of equations

$$\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u}_K) := \left(\bar{F}_{K,\bar{e}}(\vec{u}_K)\right)_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K} = \vec{0} \tag{4.9}$$

to eliminate the flux variables $u_{K,e}$ for $e \subset \partial K$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let C_K be strictly monotone. Then for arbitrary $(\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ there exists a unique triple $\vec{u}_K = (u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, such that (4.9) is satisfied.*

Proof. System (4.9) is equivalent to the following variational problem (cf. the proof of Lemma 4.1): Find $\mathbf{u}_K \in V_K$, such that for all $\mathbf{v}_K \in V_K$

$$a_K(\mathbf{u}_K,\mathbf{v}_K) - b_K\big(\mathbf{v}_K, p_K(\vec{u}_K)\big) = -d_K(\mu_K,\mathbf{v}_K)\,. \tag{4.10}$$

Here we equip $V_K = RT_0(K)$ with the $(L^s(K))^2$-norm $\|\cdot\|_{V_K} = \|\cdot\|_{0,s,K}$. If $\mu_K := \sum_{e\subset\partial K}\mu_e\chi_e$ is given, we have $d_K(\mu_K,\cdot) \in V_K'$. Let the operator A_K be defined as in (4.4). Furthermore, we employ the (linear) operator $B_K : V_K \to Q_K'$, defined by $\langle B_K\mathbf{v}_K, q_K\rangle_{Q_K'\times Q_K} = b_K(\mathbf{v}_K,q_K)$ for $\mathbf{v}_K \in V_K$ and $q_K \in Q_K$, where $Q_K := P_0(K)$ is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Q_K} = \|\cdot\|_{0,r,K}$. Identifying $\vec{u}_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\mathbf{u}_K \in V_K$ again, we define a nonlinear operator $\bar{A}_K : V_K \to V_K'$ by

$$\big\langle \bar{A}_K\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K\big\rangle_{V_K'\times V_K} := \langle A_K\mathbf{u}_K,\mathbf{v}_K\rangle_{V_K'\times V_K} - \langle B_K\mathbf{v}_K, p_K(\vec{u}_K)\rangle_{Q_K'\times Q_K}. \tag{4.11}$$

Evidently, $\bar{A}_K$ is continuous. Furthermore, $\bar{A}_K$ inherits the strict monotonicity and coercivity of A_K, since for $\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K \in V_K$

$$\langle B_K(\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K), p_K(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{v}_K)\rangle_{Q'_K \times Q_K} = b_K(\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K, p_K(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{v}_K)) = \int_K \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K)\,(p_K(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{v}_K))\; d\mathbf{x} \leq 0\,.$$

This inequality follows in the following manner from the monotonicity of C_K:

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K)\big(p_K(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{v}_K)\big) = \left(\sum_e u_{K,e} - \sum_e v_{K,e}\right)\big(p_K(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{v}_K)\big)$$

$$= \left(\left(\int_K f\,d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{e\subset\partial K} v_{K,e}\right) - \left(\int_K f\,d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{e\subset\partial K} u_{K,e}\right)\right)\big(p_K(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{v}_K)\big)$$

$$= \big(C_K\big(p_K(\vec{v}_K)\big) - C_K\big(p_K(\vec{u}_K)\big)\big)\big(p_K(\vec{u}_K) - p_K(\vec{v}_K)\big) \leq 0\,.$$

Again, the Theorem of Browder and Minty [8, Thm. 26.A] yields that there exists a unique solution $\mathbf{u}_K \in V_K$ of (4.10). The corresponding triple $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the solution of (4.9). □

Again, (4.9) can not be solved in closed form. Hence, we have to use a numerical method like Newton's method. Under certain assumptions on G and R, we can show that $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K$ is continuously differentiable and that the Jacobian matrix $D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K$ is invertible.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $G : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and $C_K : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuously differentiable and let $C'_K \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Then for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and any choice of $(\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the mapping*

$$\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3 \quad , \quad \vec{u} = (u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K} \mapsto \left(\bar{F}_{K,\bar{e}}\left((u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K}, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right)\right)_{\bar{e}\subset\partial K}$$

is continuously differentiable in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Proof. Like in the proof of Lemma 4.2 we show that the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial \bar{F}_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}) = \frac{\partial f_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}) - \frac{\partial p_K}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u})$$

for $\bar{e}, \bar{f} \subset \partial K$ exist and are continuous. The partial derivatives $\partial f_{K,\bar{e}}/\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}$ are considered in the proof of Lemma 4.2. Thus we only have to deal with the partial derivatives $\partial p_K/\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}$. Since p_K is the solution of (4.1b), we can compute these derivatives by means of the implicit function theorem:

$$\frac{\partial p_K}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}) = -\left(\frac{\partial F_K}{\partial p_K}(\vec{u}, p_K(\vec{u}))\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial F_K}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}(\vec{u}, p_K(\vec{u}))\,.$$

Evidently, $\partial F_K/\partial u_{K,\bar{f}} = 1$ for all $\bar{f} \subset \partial K$ and $\partial F_K/\partial p_K = C'_K$. Since $C'_K \neq 0$, $p_K(\vec{u})$ is continuously differentiable. □

Lemma 4.6. *Assume that the assumptions of Lemmas 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 are fulfilled. Then for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and any choice of $(\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the Jacobian matrix*

$$D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u}) := \left(\frac{\partial \bar{F}_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}}\left((u_{K,e})_{e\subset\partial K}, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right)\right)_{\bar{e},\bar{f}\subset\partial K}$$

is invertible.

Proof. Like in the proof of Lemma 4.4 we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \bar{A}_K \mathbf{u}_K - \bar{A}_K \mathbf{v}_K, \mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K \right\rangle_{V_K' \times V_K} &\geq \langle A_K \mathbf{u}_K - A_K \mathbf{v}_K, \mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K \rangle_{V_K' \times V_K} \\ &\geq \underline{a} \, \|\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K}^2 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K \in V_K \, .\end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.3

$$\begin{aligned}|\vec{v}_K - \vec{u}_K| &\leq C_1 \, \|\mathbf{v}_K - \mathbf{u}_K\|_{V_K} \leq \frac{C_1}{\underline{a}} \left\|\bar{A}_K \mathbf{v}_K - \bar{A}_K \mathbf{u}_K\right\|_{V_K'} \\ &\leq \frac{C_1 C_2}{\underline{a}} \left|((f_{K,\bar{e}} - p_K)(\vec{v}_K) - (f_{K,\bar{e}} - p_K)(\vec{u}_K))_{\bar{e} \subset \partial K}\right|\end{aligned}$$

for all $\vec{v}, \vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. This implies the invertibility of $D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K(\vec{u})$. □

4.3. **Elimination of flux and element variables – 2nd possibility.** There is another possibility to eliminate the flux variables $u_{K,e}$ for $e \subset \partial K$ and the element variables p_K for every $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. We can consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} F_{K,\bar{e}} \left((u_{K,e})_{e \subset \partial K}, p_K, (\mu_e)_{e \subset \partial K} \right) &= 0 \, , \quad \bar{e} \subset \partial K \, , \\ F_K \left((u_{K,e})_{e \subset \partial K}, p_K \right) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

which defines (implicitly) the local variables $u_{K,e}$ ($e \subset \partial K$) and p_K depending on $(\mu_e)_{e \subset \partial K}$. To this end we define for given values of μ_f ($f \subset \partial K$) a mapping $\mathbf{F}_K : \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ via

$$\mathbf{F}_K \left((u_{K,e})_{e \subset \partial K}, p_K \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \left(F_{K,\bar{e}} \left((u_{K,e})_{e \subset \partial K}, p_K, (\mu_f)_{f \subset \partial K} \right) \right)_{\bar{e} \subset \partial K} \\ F_K \left((u_{K,e})_{e \subset \partial K}, (\mu_f)_{f \subset \partial K} \right) \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4.13}$$

Of course, (4.12) is uniquely solvable, too:

Lemma 4.7. *Let R be strictly monotone. Then for any choice of $(\mu_f)_{f \subset \partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ there exists a unique solution $((u_{K,e})_{e \subset \partial K}, p_K) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ of (4.12).*

Proof. Evidently, system (4.12) is equivalent to the variational problem: Find $(\mathbf{u}_K, p_K) \in V_K \times Q_K$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_K(\mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K) \, d\mathbf{x} - b_K(\mathbf{v}_K, p_K) &= -d_K(\mu_K, \mathbf{v}_K) && \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_K \in V_K \, , \\ c_K(p_K, q_K) + b_K(\mathbf{u}_K, q_K) &= f(q_K) && \text{for all } q_K \in Q_K \, . \end{aligned}$$

The unique solvability of this problem follows similarly to [6, Thm. 1.8 or Thm. 2.4]. □

To solve (4.12) by Newton's method, we need again:

Lemma 4.8. *Let the assumptions of Lemma 4.5 be fulfilled. Then for every $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and any choice of $(\mu_f)_{f \subset \partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the mapping $\mathbf{F}_K$ from (4.13) is continuously differentiable in $\mathbb{R}^4$.*

Proof. We have seen already in the proof of Lemma 4.5 that the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial F_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}} \, , \quad \frac{\partial F_{K,\bar{e}}}{\partial p_K} = -1 \, , \quad \frac{\partial F_K}{\partial u_{K,\bar{f}}} = 1 \text{ and } \quad \frac{\partial F_K}{\partial p_K} = C_K'$$

exist and are continuous. □

Lemma 4.9. *Let the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 are fulfilled. Then for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and any choice of $(\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the Jacobian matrix*

$$D\mathbf{F}_K\left((u_{K,e})_e, p_K\right) := \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}_K\left((u_{K,e})_e, p_K\right)}{\partial((u_{K,e})_e, p_K)}$$

is invertible.

Proof. We show that the determinant of

$$D\mathbf{F}_K = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial F_{K,e_1}}{\partial u_{K,e_1}} & \frac{\partial F_{K,e_1}}{\partial u_{K,e_2}} & \frac{\partial F_{K,e_1}}{\partial u_{K,e_3}} & -1 \\ \frac{\partial F_{K,e_2}}{\partial u_{K,e_1}} & \frac{\partial F_{K,e_2}}{\partial u_{K,e_2}} & \frac{\partial F_{K,e_2}}{\partial u_{K,e_3}} & -1 \\ \frac{\partial F_{K,e_3}}{\partial u_{K,e_1}} & \frac{\partial F_{K,e_3}}{\partial u_{K,e_2}} & \frac{\partial F_{K,e_3}}{\partial u_{K,e_3}} & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \frac{\partial F_K}{\partial p_K} \end{pmatrix}$$

does not vanish. Since $\frac{\partial F_K}{\partial p_K} = C'_K > 0$, we can multiply the last row by $\left(\frac{\partial F_K}{\partial p_K}\right)^{-1}$ and add the result successively to the first three rows. This way, we eliminate the first three entries of the last column. An expansion of the determinant along the last column finally yields

$$\det(D\mathbf{F}_K) = \frac{\partial F_K}{\partial p_K} \det(D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K) \neq 0\,,$$

because $D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K$ is invertible, as we have seen in the proof of Lemma 4.5. □

5. Solution of resulting system of equations

All the possibilities for static condensation presented in the last section reduce the number of equations and of degrees of freedom. If we eliminate only the flux variables, as described in Subsection 4.1, we still have to compute the values $(p_K)_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}$ of element variables and $(\mu_e)_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i}$ of Lagrange-multipliers. If we eliminate the flux and element variables, as described in Subsections 4.2 and 4.3, we still have to compute the values $(\mu_e)_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i}$ of Lagrange-multipliers.

5.1. Linearization by Newton's method.

The elimination of variables, as described in Section 4, introduces nonlinearities into the originally linear equation (4.1c). If we proceed as described in Subsection 4.1, we introduce also additional nonlinearities into (4.1b). We propose Newton's method for the linearization of the resulting system of equations. Below, we describe, how the entries of the Jacobian matrix can be computed.

Computation of the Jacobian matrix after elimination of flux variables. After solving the system of equations (4.2) for some $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the flux variables $u_{K,e}$ $(e \subset \partial K)$ are uniquely defined as implicit functions depending on p_K and $(\mu_f)_{f\in\partial K}$:

$$u_{K,e} = u_{K,e}\left(p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right) \quad \text{for } e \in \partial K\,.$$

While computing the partial derivatives of F_K and $F_{\bar{e}}$, we have to take this dependence into account.

Hence we obtain the following expressions for the entries of the Jacobian matrix:

$$\frac{\partial F_K}{\partial p_K} = \sum_{e\subset\partial K} \frac{\partial u_{K,e}}{\partial p_K}\left(p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right) + C'_K\,, \qquad \forall\, K\in\mathcal{T}_h\,,$$

$$\frac{\partial F_K}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} = \sum_{e\subset\partial K} \frac{\partial u_{K,e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\left(p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right)\,, \qquad \forall\, K\in\mathcal{T}_h\,,\ \bar f\subset\partial K\,,$$

$$\frac{\partial F_{\bar e}}{\partial p_K} = \frac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial p_K}\left(p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right)\,, \qquad \forall\, \bar e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i\,,\ \bar e\subset\partial K\,,$$

$$\frac{\partial F_{\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} = \frac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\left(p_K, (\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right) + \delta_{\bar e,\bar f}\frac{\partial u_{K',\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\left(p_{K'}, (\mu_{f'})_{f'\subset\partial K'}\right)\,,$$
$$\forall\, \bar e,\bar f\in\mathcal{E}_h^i\,,\ \bar e=\partial K\cap\partial K'\,,\ \bar f\subset\partial K\,.$$

Note that we need the partial derivatives $\partial u_{K,\bar e}/\partial p_K$ resp. $\partial u_{K,\bar e}/\partial \mu_{\bar f}$. By means of the implicit function theorem these partial derivatives are given by:

$$\left(\frac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial p_K}\right)_{\bar e\subset\partial K} = -D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial F_{K,\bar e}}{\partial p_K}\right)_{\bar e\subset\partial K}$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\right)_{\bar e,\bar f\subset\partial K} = -D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial F_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\right)_{\bar e,\bar f\subset\partial K}\,.$$

We therefore need the inverse of the local matrix $D\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_K$. In Lemma 4.3 we showed that this inverse does exist. In addition, we need the following partial derivatives:

$$\frac{\partial F_{K,\bar e}}{\partial p_K} = -1 \quad\text{and}\quad \frac{\partial F_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} = \delta_{\bar e,\bar f}\,.$$

Computation of the Jacobian matrix after elimination of flux and element variables according to the 1st possibility. After elimination of flux and element variables as described in Subsection 4.2, we have to solve only the system $(F_{\bar e}=0)_{\bar e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i}$ for the unknowns $(\mu_e)_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i}$. Since $u_{K,\bar e}$ depends nonlinearly on μ_e ($e\subset\partial K$), these equations become nonlinear. To solve this system by means of Newton's method we therefore need the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial F_{\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} = \frac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\left((\mu_f)_{f\subset\partial K}\right) + \delta_{\bar e,\bar f}\frac{\partial u_{K',\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\left((\mu_{f'})_{f'\subset\partial K'}\right)$$

for $\bar e,\bar f\in\mathcal{E}_h^i$, $\bar e=\partial K\cap\partial K'$, $\bar f\subset\partial K$. Again, the implicit function theorem yields the formula for the computation of the partial derivatives $\partial u_{K,\bar e}/\partial\mu_{\bar f}$:

$$\left(\frac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\right)_{\bar e,\bar f\subset\partial K} = -D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial \bar F_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\right)_{\bar e,\bar f\subset\partial K}\,.$$

Since $\dfrac{\partial \bar F_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} = \delta_{\bar e,\bar f}$, we have $\left(\dfrac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}}\right)_{\bar e,\bar f\subset\partial K} = -D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K^{-1}$. The existence of $D\bar{\mathbf{F}}_K^{-1}$ is established in Lemma 4.6.

Computation of the Jacobian matrix after elimination of flux and element variables according to the 2nd possibility. After elimination of flux and element variables as described in Subsection 4.3, we again have to solve the system

$(F_{\bar e} = 0)_{\bar e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i}$ for $(\mu_e)_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i}$. Since these equations become nonlinear, we propose Newton's method to solve them. Again, we need the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial F_{\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} = \frac{\partial u_{K,\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} \left((\mu_f)_{f \subset \partial K} \right) + \delta_{\bar e, \bar f} \frac{\partial u_{K',\bar e}}{\partial \mu_{\bar f}} \left((\mu_{f'})_{f' \subset \partial K'} \right)$$

for $\bar e, \bar f \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$, $\bar e = \partial K \cap \partial K'$, $\bar f \subset \partial K$. Now the implicit function theorem yields the following formula for the computation of these partial derivatives:

$$\frac{\partial \left((u_{K,\bar e})_{\bar e \subset \partial K}, p_K \right)}{\partial \left((\mu_{\bar f})_{\bar f \subset \partial K} \right)} = D\mathbf{F}_K^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}_K}{\partial \left((\mu_{\bar f})_{\bar f} \right)} .$$

Finally, we note that $\partial F_{K,\bar e}/\partial \mu_{\bar f} = \delta_{\bar e, \bar f}$ and $\partial F_K / \partial \mu_{\bar f} = 0$ for $\bar e, \bar f \subset \partial K$.

5.2. **Multigrid algorithms for the linearized equations.** We have shown in Section 3 that after elimination of the flux variables the hybridized mixed formulation is equivalent to the nonconforming finite element method (3.1). Hence we can apply the multigrid algorithm developed for this type of nonconforming discretization [3] to solve the system of linearized equations.

Furthermore, Chen [5] showed that – at least for linear elliptic problems – the equations after elimination of flux and element variables correspond to the equations resulting from a nonconforming discretization using the Crouzeix–Raviart ansatz space. Therefore the intergrid transfer operators for the Crouzeix–Raviart ansatz space [2] can be used to develop a multigrid algorithm for this linear system. We do not show this equivalence for the nonlinear problem, but propose to use this multigrid algorithm. It showed a good convergence behavior in numerical experiments.

6. Application to Darcy–Forchheimer flow in porous media

The flow of a gas through a porous medium is described by the following equations (see e.g. [7]): the Darcy–Forchheimer equation

$$\frac{\mu(\mathbf{x},t)}{k(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x},t) + \beta_{\mathrm{Fo}}(\mathbf{x}) \rho(\mathbf{x},t) |\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x},t)| \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x},t) + \nabla P(\mathbf{x},t) = 0 , \quad (\mathbf{x},t) \in \Omega \times [0,T] ,$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the euclidean norm, the continuity equation

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{x},t)}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}(\rho(\mathbf{x},t)\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x},t)) = \tilde f(\mathbf{x},t) , \quad (\mathbf{x},t) \in \Omega \times [0,T]$$

and an equation of state, we take the ideal gas law

$$\rho(\mathbf{x},t) = \frac{P(\mathbf{x},t)\, W(\mathbf{x},t)}{R_0\, \Theta(\mathbf{x},t)} =: P(\mathbf{x},t)\gamma(\mathbf{x},t) , \quad (\mathbf{x},t) \in \Omega \times [0,T] .$$

The unknowns here are the pressure P, the density ρ and the volumetric flow rate $\mathbf{v}$ of the gas. Porosity ϕ, permeability k and Forchheimer coefficient β_{Fo} of the porous medium, viscosity μ, molecular weight W and temperature Θ of the gas, and the universal gas constant R_0 are given as well as the source term $\tilde f$. Assuming $\rho > 0$ and introducing new variables $p = |P|P$ and $\mathbf{u} = |\rho|\mathbf{v}$ these equations can be transformed into

$$(\alpha(\mathbf{x},t) + \beta(\mathbf{x},t)|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t)|)\, \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t) + \nabla p(\mathbf{x},t) = 0 , \qquad (\mathbf{x},t) \in \Omega \times [0,T] , \tag{6.1a}$$

$$\phi(\mathbf{x})\, \partial_t \rho(p(\mathbf{x},t),\mathbf{x},t) + \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t) = \tilde f(\mathbf{x},t) , \quad (\mathbf{x},t) \in \Omega \times [0,T] , \tag{6.1b}$$

where

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x},t) := \frac{W(\mathbf{x},t)}{R_0\,\Theta(\mathbf{x},t)}\,, \quad \alpha(\mathbf{x},t) := \frac{2\,\mu(\mathbf{x},t)}{\gamma(\mathbf{x},t)\,k(\mathbf{x})}\,, \quad \beta(\mathbf{x},t) := \frac{2\,\beta_{\mathrm{Fo}}(\mathbf{x})}{\gamma(\mathbf{x},t)}\,,$$

and the equation of state $\rho = \rho(p)$ is defined by

$$\rho(p(\mathbf{x},t),\mathbf{x},t) := \gamma(\mathbf{x},t)\frac{p(\mathbf{x},t)}{\sqrt{|p(\mathbf{x},t)|}}\,. \tag{6.2}$$

In particular, we consider the mixed finite element discretization of the semidiscrete problem with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Discretization in time of the continuity equation (6.1b) with the implicit Euler method yields for the k-th time step

$$\left(\alpha^k(\mathbf{x}) + \beta^k(\mathbf{x})|\mathbf{u}^k(\mathbf{x})|\right)\mathbf{u}^k(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla p^k(\mathbf{x}) = 0\,, \qquad \mathbf{x}\in\Omega\,, \tag{6.3a}$$

(6.3b)

$$\frac{\phi(\mathbf{x})}{\Delta t}\gamma^k(\mathbf{x})\frac{p^k(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{|p^k(\mathbf{x})|}} - \frac{\phi(\mathbf{x})}{\Delta t}\gamma^{k-1}(\mathbf{x})\frac{p^{k-1}(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{|p^{k-1}(\mathbf{x})|}} + \operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}^k(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{f}^k(\mathbf{x})\,, \qquad \mathbf{x}\in\Omega\,,$$

$$p^k(\mathbf{x}) = g^k(\mathbf{x})\,, \quad \mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega\,. \tag{6.3c}$$

The initial condition $p(\cdot,t^0) = p^0(\cdot)$ is given. Similarly, we use the denotations $p^k := p(\cdot,t^k)$ and $\mathbf{u}^k := \mathbf{u}(\cdot,t^k)$ for the unknown solutions and, analogously defined, α^k, β^k and γ^k for the coefficient functions, g^k for the boundary conditions and $\tilde{f}^k$ for the source term. Note that for each $k\in\{1,\dots,K\}$ the function p^{k-1} is known. Hence we can define an augmented source term by

$$f^k(\mathbf{x}) := \tilde{f}^k(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\phi(\mathbf{x})}{\Delta t}\gamma^{k-1}(\mathbf{x})\frac{p^{k-1}(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{|p^{k-1}(\mathbf{x})|}}\,.$$

Evidently, (6.3) is of the form (1.3). Omitting the superscript k, the nonlinear mappings R and G are defined by

$$R(p) := \frac{\phi}{\Delta t}\gamma\frac{p}{\sqrt{|p|}} \quad \text{and} \quad G(\mathbf{u}) := (\alpha+\beta|\mathbf{u}|)\,\mathbf{u}\,.$$

We require $\phi,\alpha,\beta,\gamma\in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and additionally

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} 0<\underline{\phi}\le\phi(\mathbf{x})\le\overline{\phi}<\infty\,,\\ 0<\underline{\alpha}\le\alpha(\mathbf{x})\le\overline{\alpha}<\infty\,,\\ 0<\underline{\beta}\le\beta(\mathbf{x})\le\overline{\beta}<\infty\,,\\ 0<\underline{\gamma}\le\gamma(\mathbf{x})\le\overline{\gamma}<\infty \end{array}\right\} \text{ for almost every } \mathbf{x}\in\Omega\,.$$

Then is is easy to show that the mapping $R : L^{3/2}(\Omega)\to L^3(\Omega)$ is continuous, coercive and strictly monotone (cf. the proof of Prop. 1.5 b) in [6]). Since ϕ and γ are bounded, an application of Hölder's inequality yields

$$\|R(p)-R(q)\|_{0,3,\Omega} \le \frac{\overline{\phi}\,\overline{\gamma}}{\Delta t}\left\|\frac{p}{\sqrt{|p|}} - \frac{q}{\sqrt{|q|}}\right\|_{0,3,\Omega} \le \frac{\overline{\phi}\,\overline{\gamma}}{\Delta t}\sqrt{2}\,\|p-q\|^{1/2}_{0,3/2,\Omega}$$

for all $p,q\in Q$. Coercivity and strict monotonicity follow directly from the fact that ϕ and γ are bounded from below by positive constants. Consequently we have $r = 3/2$ and $r' = 3$ here.

Similarly, we obtain that $G : \left(L^3(\Omega)\right)^2 \to \left(L^{3/2}(\Omega)\right)^2$ is a continuous and uniformly monotone mapping (see the proof of Prop. 1.2 in [6]). Indeed, an application of Hölder's inequality yields

$$\|G\mathbf{u} - G\mathbf{v}\|_{0,3/2,\Omega} \leq \left(C(\overline{\alpha}) + C(\overline{\beta})\left(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{0,3,\Omega} + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,3,\Omega}\right)\right)\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_{0,3,\Omega}\,,$$

where $C(\overline{\alpha})$ and $C(\overline{\beta})$ are constants depending only on $\overline{\alpha}$, $\overline{\beta}$ and the domain Ω. Furthermore,

$$\int_\Omega (G\mathbf{u} - G\mathbf{v}) \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\, d\mathbf{x} \geq \frac{C(\underline{\beta})}{2}\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|^3_{0,3,\Omega} \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \left(L^3(\Omega)\right)^2\,,$$

where $C(\underline{\beta})$ depends only on $\underline{\beta}$ and Ω. In particular, the uniform monotonicity of G implies that G is strictly monotone and coercive. Thus G is invertible. The inverse mapping G^{-1} is given by

$$G^{-1}(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\beta|\mathbf{v}|} - \alpha}{2\beta|\mathbf{v}|}\,\mathbf{v}\,.$$

Consequently we have $s = 3$ and $s' = 3/2$ here and the space V is given by

$$V = W^3(\mathrm{div}; \Omega) := \left\{\mathbf{v} \in \left(L^3(\Omega)\right)^2 \;\middle|\; \mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{v} \in L^3(\Omega)\right\}\,.$$

Some properties of $W^3(\mathrm{div}; \Omega)$ are established in [6, Appendix].

Obviously, G fulfills $G(-\mathbf{v}) = -G(\mathbf{v})$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in V$. Furthermore, $G : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is continuously differentiable, since all partial derivatives are continuous. The Jacobian matrix of G is given by $DG(\mathbf{x}) = (\alpha + \beta|\mathbf{x}|)\mathrm{Id} + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T$, where Id denotes the unit matrix. In Lemma 4.3 we employed the assumption that there is a constant $\underline{a} > 0$ and a norm $\|\cdot\|_{V_K}$ on V_K such that the operator $A_K : V_K \to V_K'$ defined in (4.4) fulfills inequality (4.6). Choosing $\|\cdot\|_{V_K} = \|\cdot\|_{0,2,\Omega}$, this inequality follows from the observation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle A_K\mathbf{u}_K - A_K\mathbf{v}_K, \mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K\rangle_{V_K' \times V_K} \\
&= \int_K \alpha(\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K) \cdot (\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K)\, d\mathbf{x} + \int_K \beta\left(|\mathbf{u}_K|\mathbf{u}_K - |\mathbf{v}_K|\mathbf{v}_K\right) \cdot (\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K)\, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\geq \underline{\alpha}\,\|\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K\|^2_{V_K} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u}_K, \mathbf{v}_K \in V_K\,,
\end{aligned}$$

because the second term is non-negative. In particular, this implies (4.6), because

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_K\mathbf{u}_K - A_K\mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K'} &= \sup_{\mathbf{w}_K \in V_K} \frac{|\langle A_K\mathbf{u}_K - A_K\mathbf{v}_K, \mathbf{w}_K\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{w}\|_{V_K}} \\
&\geq \frac{|\langle A_K\mathbf{u}_K - A_K\mathbf{v}_K, \mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K}} \geq \underline{\alpha}\,\|\mathbf{u}_K - \mathbf{v}_K\|_{V_K}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

For the elimination of element variables, we need the monotonicity of the mapping $C_K : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Here

$$C_K(p_K) = \int_K R(p_K)\, d\mathbf{x} = \int_K \frac{\phi}{\Delta t}\gamma\frac{p_K}{\sqrt{|p_K|}}\, d\mathbf{x} = \int_K \frac{\phi}{\Delta t}\gamma\, d\mathbf{x}\,\frac{p_K}{\sqrt{|p_K|}}$$

such that C_K is strictly monotone, since the integral is positive. Note that C_K is continuously differentiable for all $p_K \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and its derivative $C_K'(p_K) = \int_K \phi\gamma\, d\mathbf{x}/(2\,\Delta t\sqrt{|p_K|})$ is not defined for $p_K = 0$. Since inversion of C_K yields

$$p_K = p_K(\vec{u}_K) = |P_K(\vec{u}_K)|\, P_K(\vec{u}_K)\,,$$

where

$$P_K(\vec{u}_K) := \frac{\Delta t}{\int_K \phi\gamma \, d\mathbf{x}} \left(\int_K f \, d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{e \subset \partial K} u_{K,e} \right),$$

we can directly compute the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial p_K}{\partial u_{K,e}}(\vec{u}) = -2 \, |P_K(\vec{u})| \, \frac{\Delta t}{\int_K \phi\gamma \, d\mathbf{x}} = -2\sqrt{|p_K(\vec{u})|} \, \frac{\Delta t}{\int_K \phi\gamma \, d\mathbf{x}}$$

without using the implicit function theorem. These partial derivatives are continuous in $\mathbb{R}$. A closer look into the proof of Lemma 4.6 shows that we needed the condition on C'_K only to ensure that the partial derivatives $\partial p_K / \partial u_{K,e}$ exist and are continuous. Thus we can replace the condition on C'_K by the requirement that the partial derivatives $\partial p_K / \partial u_{K,e}$ exist and are continuous, which is fulfilled in our application.

References

1. T. Arbogast and Z. Chen, *On the implementation of mixed methods as nonconforming methods for second-order elliptic problems*, Math. Comput. **64** (1995), 943–972.
2. D. Braess and R. Verfürth, *Multigrid methods for nonconforming Finite Element Methods*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **27** (1990), 979–986.
3. S. C. Brenner, *Multigrid algorithm for the lowest-order Raviart-Thomas mixed triangular finite element method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **29** (1992), 647–678.
4. F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, *Mixed and hybrid finite element methods*, Springer series in computational mathematics, vol. 15, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1991.
5. Z. Chen, *Equivalence between and multigrid algorithms for nonconforming and mixed methods for second-order elliptic problems*, East-West J. Numer. Math., **4** (1996), 1–33.
6. P. Knabner and G. Summ, *Solvability of the mixed formulation for Darcy–Forchheimer flow in porous media*, submitted to M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.
7. S. Whitaker, *The Forchheimer equation: A theoretical development*, Transp. Porous Media, **25** (1996), 27–61.
8. E. Zeidler *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications – Nonlinear monotone operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1990.

Institute for Applied Mathematics, University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Martensstr. 3, D-91058 Erlangen, Germany

E-mail address: knabner@am.uni-erlangen.de

Institute for Applied Mathematics, University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Martensstr. 3, D-91058 Erlangen, Germany

E-mail address: summ@am.uni-erlangen.de